

WALTER ENGLERT

FANUM AND PHILOSOPHY: CICERO AND THE DEATH OF TULLIA

Cicero was devastated by the death of his daughter Tullia in February 45<sup>1</sup>. Over the next few months he withdrew from society and tried to console himself by various means, including staying with his closest friend Atticus in Rome, seeking solitude in his villa at Astura and Atticus's villa at Nomentum, reading consolation letters from friends, and consulting whatever philosophical consolation literature he could find. None of these early attempts was effective, and Cicero sought less traditional means of consoling himself. He composed a consolation to himself (the *Consolatio*), planned a shrine (*fanum*) for Tullia that he hoped would accomplish her deification, and wrote a series of philosophical works which helped him deal with his loss<sup>2</sup>. A number of excellent studies have examined elements of Cicero's response to Tullia's death<sup>3</sup>. One question, however, that has remained puzzling is why Cicero, after repeatedly stating in his letters to Atticus that he must build a shrine to Tullia, fails to do so. In this paper I suggest an answer to this question by considering Cicero's comments to Atticus about his need to build a *fanum* for Tullia and what he says about dealing with grief in the *Tusculan Disputations*. Cicero, far from simply failing to complete Tullia's *fanum*, seems to have made a conscious decision on philosophical grounds not to build it. This decision was part of a longer process of deliberation that Cicero went through from the *Consolatio* to the *Tusculan Disputations* to find a way to lessen his own grief and honor Tullia fittingly.

---

<sup>1</sup> All dates are BCE.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero notes the comfort he found in writing at *Att.* 12, 15 (SB 252); 12, 16 (SB 253); 12, 18 (SB 254); 12, 28 (SB 267); 12, 38 (SB 278); 12, 38a (SB 279). This was of course not the main reason Cicero had for writing his philosophical works, but he welcomed the way it helped him deal with the loss of Tullia and the political turmoil of the period. (All references to Cicero's *Letters* in the article include both the traditional numbering and the numbering in Shackleton Bailey's authoritative editions).

<sup>3</sup> Important studies that treat aspects of Cicero's response to Tullia's death include those of Boyancé 1944, Sullivan 1944, Shackleton Bailey 1966, Lepage 1976, Beaujeu 1983, Zehnacker 1985, Guillaumont 1989, White 1995, Erskine 1997, Wilcox 2005a, Treggiari 2007, Altman 2008 and 2009, Baltussen 2009 and 2013, Baraz 2012, Cole 2013, Konstan 2015.

### 1. *Public and private turmoil*

Tullia's death in mid-February 45 occurred during a period of great upheaval and uncertainty for Cicero and the Roman Republic. Julius Caesar defeated Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalus in Greece in 48, consolidated his power in the years that followed, and became dictator. Cicero, after great hesitation, had joined Pompey's forces in Greece. He returned to Italy after Pompey's defeat and successfully sought Caesar's pardon. Under Caesar's dictatorship, Cicero delivered several speeches<sup>4</sup>, but otherwise retired from public life. He wrote a number of rhetorical treatises in 46, including the *Brutus*, *Stoic Paradoxes*, and the *Orator*, and towards the end of 46 and beginning of 45 he had begun to work on a philosophical dialogue, the *Hortensius*, in which he argued for the value of studying philosophy<sup>5</sup>. Cicero's private life was also in turmoil during this period. He had divorced Terentia, his wife of thirty years, sometime in 47-46, and married a much younger woman, Publilia, towards the end of 46<sup>6</sup>. This second marriage quickly failed, and he divorced Publilia in 45 not long after Tullia's death.

Cicero had always been extremely close to Tullia<sup>7</sup>, and his relationship to her had been one of the few stabilizing factors in his life during this period of public and private turmoil<sup>8</sup>. She had been married three times, and it was during this period that she and her third husband Dolabella divorced. Tullia was pregnant at the time of the divorce, and she moved into Cicero's house in Rome, giving birth to a son in the middle of January 45. Tullia, about thirty-two or thirty-three at the time, was not well after the birth, and Cicero eventually moved her and the baby to

---

<sup>4</sup> These speeches included the *Pro Marcello*, the two speeches *Pro Ligario* (one delivered privately at Caesar's house, one in public), and the *Pro Rege Deiotaro*.

<sup>5</sup> The dating of the *Hortensius* is controversial. Scholars are divided about whether Cicero had begun (or even finished) the work before Tullia's death in Feb. 45, or whether he wrote it after she died. I think the evidence favors the former view, but the dating of the *Hortensius* does not affect my argument. On various views on the dating, see Marinone 2004, 213 and Grilli 2010, 5-7.

<sup>6</sup> For an excellent account of Terentia, Publilia, and their marriages to Cicero, see Treggiari 2007.

<sup>7</sup> See Treggiari 1998, 12-13.

<sup>8</sup> How much Cicero relied on Tullia during this period is clear from his letters. For a relevant selection of passages from these letters, see Treggiari 2007, 100-142. See especially Cicero's letter to Servius Sulpicius Rufus *Fam.* 4. 6 (SB 249) where he writes about Tullia, «this one solace was left, which has been taken away» (*unum manebat illud solacium quod ereptum est*).

his villa at Tusculum for further care. There, about a month after giving birth, Tullia died, and the baby lived only a few months longer<sup>9</sup>.

Cicero's thoughts and actions in the first weeks after Tullia's death are unknown to us, since no letters survive from this period. If Cicero followed normal Roman funeral practices, Tullia's body would have been cremated, either at Tusculum or Rome<sup>10</sup>, and her ashes placed in an urn that would have been interred in a family tomb. Cicero never mentions any details about her burial or tomb, preferring instead, as we will see, to focus on planning a different type of memorial for her. After the funeral, Cicero could not bear to be at Tusculum. He stayed with Atticus in Rome through the end of March, and then went to his own villa at Astura on the coast south of Rome<sup>11</sup>. Cicero's letters reveal how difficult he found his grief at Tullia's death to endure, and he sought various means of alleviating it. It was also during this period that he received and replied to consolation letters from friends, which he valued but did not find particularly helpful<sup>12</sup>.

## 2. *The Consolatio*

Cicero's first sustained attempt to deal with his grief was writing his *Consolatio*<sup>13</sup>. After Tullia's death, he read every work of consolation he could find, but to no avail<sup>14</sup>. To lessen his sorrow, he took the unusual step of writing a consolation to himself. Cicero claimed that no one had done this before, and the few fragments that remain show that it was an unusual work<sup>15</sup>. Perhaps its most unique feature was its form. Normally,

---

<sup>9</sup> Marinone 2004, 211; cf. *Att.* 12, 13, 1 (SB 250); 12, 18a (SB 256); 12, 28, 3 (SB 267). The baby was named Lentulus, after his father Dolabella's own adoptive name.

<sup>10</sup> Treggiari 2007, 135 suggests she may have been cremated in Rome, and Shackleton Bailey 1971, 204 writes, «The funeral probably took place in Rome».

<sup>11</sup> For the chronology of Cicero's actions after Tullia's death, see Shackleton Bailey 1971, 201-215.

<sup>12</sup> Cicero received letters of consolation from, among others, Brutus, Caesar, and Servius Sulpicius Rufus. Sulpicius's consolation letter and Cicero's response are extant: *Fam.* 4, 5 (SB 248) and 4, 6 (SB 249). On these letters see Wilcox 2005b, 244-253.

<sup>13</sup> On the *Consolatio* see Kumaniecki 1968 and 1972, 466; Vitelli 1973 and 1979; Mazzoli 1982; Setaioli 1999; Audano, 2006-2007; Baltussen 2013.

<sup>14</sup> *Att.* 12, 14 (SB 251).

<sup>15</sup> *Att.* 12, 14 (SB 251). Cicero notes about the *Consolatio*, «Indeed I have done what certainly no one has done before me: I myself have consoled myself through writing» (*quin etiam feci, quod profecto ante me nemo, ut ipse me per litteras consolaretur*).

a consolation implies two individuals: the consoler and the consoled. In the *Consolatio*, Cicero took both parts, addressing himself and speaking in the first person. The *Consolatio* was an attempt by Cicero to get greater perspective on his grief, apparently imagining a philosophically more detached Cicero attempting to console the grieving Cicero. Only fragments of the *Consolatio* survive, but enough remains to get a sense of the content and structure of the work<sup>16</sup>. In it he apparently gave the views of the various philosophical schools on diminishing grief<sup>17</sup>. Particularly interesting for our purposes is Lactantius's report about a section of the *Consolatio* in which Cicero describes his plan to erect an *imago* – an image or statue – of Tullia in the context of discussing the deification (*consecratio*) of the children of great figures from the past. (Mueller fr. 11 = Vitelli fr. 23 = Lactant. *inst. div.* 1, 15, 16):

itaque intra paucos versiculos duas res nobis dedit; nam dum imaginem filiae eodem se modo consecraturum esse profiteretur, quo illi a veteribus sunt consecrati, et illos mortuos esse docuit et originem vanae superstitionis ostendit. Cum vero inquit et mares et feminas complures ex hominibus in deorum numero esse videamus et eorum in urbibus atque agris augustissima delubra veneremur, adsentiamur eorum sapientiae, quorum ingeniis et inventis omnem vitam legibus et institutis excultam constitutamque habemus. Quodsi ullum umquam animal consecrandum fuit, illud profecto fuit. Si Cadmi progenies aut Amphitryonis aut Tyndari in caelum tollenda fama fuit, huic idem honos certe dicandus est; quod quidem faciam teque omnium optimam doctissimamque adprobantibus dis immortalibus ipsis in eorum coetu locatam ad opinionem omnium mortalium consecrabo.

*And so he [Cicero] has given us two things within a few lines. For while he publicly declared (profiteretur) that he would consecrate an image (imaginem) to his daughter in the same way that they [= others held to be gods] had been divinized by people of old, he also revealed that they are dead and the source of empty superstition. «Truly», [Cicero] says, «when we see that from humankind a large number of men and women are numbered among the gods, and that we show reverence to their most holy shrines (delubra) in cities and in the country, let us assent to the wisdom of those by whose genius and discoveries our whole way of life has been cultivated and improved by laws and institutions. But if any living creature ever should have been deified, it was surely this one [Tul-*

<sup>16</sup> For plausible reconstructions of the outline of the work see Kumaniecki 1968, Vitelli 1979, 22-23, and Baltussen 2013.

<sup>17</sup> See *Tusc.* 3, 76 and Kumaniecki 1968.

lia]. If it was right for the offspring of Cadmus or Amphitryon or Tyndareus to be raised to heaven by fame, the same honor should certainly be dedicated to her [Tullia]; and indeed this I will do and I will deify you, the best and most learned of all, with the immortal gods themselves assenting, placed among their assembly, for the belief of all mortals»<sup>18</sup>.

Just as the offspring of Cadmus, Amphitryon, and Tyndareus succeeded in obtaining deification, so, Cicero states, will he obtain the same honor for Tullia. In the passage, Lactantius claims that Cicero publicly declared (*profiteretur*) in the *Consolatio* that he would dedicate an image (*imago*) to Tullia. The language that Lactantius reports Cicero used is important. The term *imago* is a general one, and can mean, depending on the context, an image, likeness, statue, picture, or bust, and in this context probably means something like a portrait statue<sup>19</sup>. More important, though, is what Cicero says he will do with the *imago*: consecrate it to her. The verb *consecro* is one normally reserved for dedicating something to a divinity, and it is clear from the context that this is what Cicero said he intended to do: to dedicate a statue<sup>20</sup> to Tullia as one worthy of divine honors.

In this passage from the *Consolatio*, Cicero also justifies his project to divinize Tullia by citing as precedents the children of great heroes of the past who were worshipped with divine honors after their deaths. He notes that if they deserved to be treated as gods and venerated, so too should Tullia. Importantly, Cicero also here indicates that part of acknowledging the divine nature of these famous offspring is showing reverence to their *delubra*, or «shrines». *Delubrum* technically refers to the area in front of an *aedes*, or temple building, but was also used generally of a sanctuary, shrine, or temple<sup>21</sup>, and was a sacred space where gods and goddesses could be worshipped through religious ritual. In this passage, then, Cicero acknowledges that he wants to secure divine honors for Tullia, intends to dedicate an *imago* to her, and believes she is just as worthy of divinization as those who have been declared gods and goddesses in the past and are now worshipped in shrines. In this passage

---

<sup>18</sup> All translations of Latin in the article are my own unless otherwise noted.

<sup>19</sup> Wrede 1981, 81.

<sup>20</sup> The statue that Cicero envisages in the *Consolatio* will be consecrated to Tullia is most likely a statue of Tullia, just as one would dedicate a statue of a divinity to that divinity. This is not certain, though, and in his letters to Atticus discussing the *fanum*, Cicero never specifically mentions a statue of Tullia.

<sup>21</sup> For *delubrum*, see OLD 1983, 511 *delubrum*; Castagnoli 1984, 4.

he does not explicitly say that he will create a *delubrum* for Tullia, but as we will see, further reflection on this theme seems to have led Cicero to consider divinizing Tullia with a shrine (*fanum*), which goes beyond the dedication of a simple *imago* that he mentions in this passage.

It is unclear where Cicero got the idea for seeking divine honors for Tullia. In another fragment of the *Consolatio* preserved in Lactantius<sup>22</sup>, Cicero notes that there are wise men (*sapientes*) who say that the souls of good and bad people take different paths after death: souls contaminated by vices and crimes are cast into darkness and lie in filth, while «chaste souls, pure, whole, and uncorrupted, smoothly polished by good studies and arts, fly with a light and easy glide to the gods, that is, to a nature similar to their own»<sup>23</sup>. Cicero does not name who these wise men are in the fragment, but Boyancé<sup>24</sup> suggested that deification was recommended in the Academic philosopher Crantor's work *On Grief* which Cicero had recently read<sup>25</sup>.

It is also hard to get a sense for how unusual Cicero's desire to divinize his daughter would have seemed in its late Republican context. Divinization was certainly uncommon before the late Republic<sup>26</sup>, and in a recent study, Spencer Cole argues that Cicero played a central role in developing the concept of deification at Rome. Cole points out that Cicero discussed the divinization of mortals in a number of his speeches (especially in the *Pro Lege Manilia* and *Pro Sestio*), philosophical dialogues (*De Re Publica*, *De Legibus*, *Consolatio*, *Tusculan Disputations*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Senectute*, and *De Amicitia*), and in the letters he wrote to Atticus about Tullia, and characterizes Cicero as one who «produced experimental works that grappled with the conceptual challenges posed by deification and diminished the distance between mor-

<sup>22</sup> Lactantius *inst. div.* 3, 19, 3-6 (Mueller fr. 12 = Vitelli fr. 22).

<sup>23</sup> *Castos autem animos, puros integros incorruptos, bonis etiam studiis atque artibus expolitos leni quodam et facili lapsu ad deos id est ad naturam similem sui pervolare.*

<sup>24</sup> Boyancé 1944, 181.

<sup>25</sup> Cicero mentions Crantor's *On Grief* several times in the philosophical works he was writing around this time: *Ac.* 2, 135; *Tusc.* 1, 115; 3, 12; 3, 71. At *Att.* 12,14 (SB 251) Cicero tells Atticus that he has read everything that has ever been written on lessening grief, and chief among these writings must have been Crantor's work. For more on the content of Crantor's work, see Zehnacker 1985, 71.

<sup>26</sup> Wrede 1981, 27-29 notes that it was during this period when the divinization of mortals begins to be represented at Rome, and he cites a few examples of the deification of women in the plastic arts. Flory 1995 discusses examples of the deification of Roman women in the late Roman republic and early principate, although she does not treat Tullia as part of her discussion.

tals and immortals»<sup>27</sup>. Given Cicero's active and continual interest in the topic of the divinization of mortals, then, no matter where he may have originally gotten the idea of divinizing Tullia, and how relatively infrequent the practice may have been, it is clear that in the *Consolatio* he announces his intention of finding a way to deify Tullia involving a statue and a shrine.

### 3. *The fanum in the letters to Atticus*

In letters he wrote to Atticus immediately after he finished the *Consolatio* Cicero further clarifies how he intended to honor Tullia: with a shrine, or *fanum*. He completed the *Consolatio* within days of arriving at his villa at Astura on March 7<sup>28</sup>, and the first mention we have of the *fanum* is in a letter he wrote to Atticus on March 11<sup>29</sup>. In it he discusses the *fanum* and what it means to him, and the passage is worth quoting at length. (*Att.* 12, 18 = SB 254):

dum recordationes fugio quae quasi morsu quodam dolorem efficiunt, refugio ad te admonendum. quod velim mihi ignoscas, cuiusmodi est. etenim habeo non nullos ex iis quos nunc lectito auctores qui dicant fieri id oportere quod saepe tecum egi et quod a te approbari volo, de fano illo dico, de quo tantum quantum me amas velim cogites. equidem neque de genere dubito (placet enim mihi Cluati) neque de re (statutum est enim), de loco non nunquam. velim igitur cogites. ego, quantum his temporibus tam eruditus fieri potuerit, profecto illam consecrabo omni genere monumentorum ab omnium ingeniis sumptorum et Graecorum et Latinorum. quae res forsitan sit refricatura vulnus meum. sed iam quasi voto quodam et promisso me teneri puto, longumque illud tempus cum non ero magis me movet quam hoc exiguum, quod mihi tamen nimium longum videtur. habeo enim nihil temptatis rebus omnibus in quo acquiescam. nam dum illud tractabam de quo ad te ante scripsi, quasi fovebam dolores meos; nunc omnia respicio nec quicquam habeo tolerabilius quam solitudinem.

*While I am now fleeing the recollections that produce pain like that from a bite, I seek refuge in sending you a reminder. Please forgive me for what I want,*

---

<sup>27</sup> Cole 2013, 17.

<sup>28</sup> Cicero mentions the *Consolatio* in a letter of March 8 (*Att.* 12, 14 = SB 251) and says he will send it to Atticus as soon as his copyists make a copy.

<sup>29</sup> *Att.* 12, 18 (SB 254).

such as it is. For I have found a number of authors among those I am now constantly reading who say that it is fitting (*oportere*) that this thing happen which I have often discussed with you and which I want you to approve. I am talking about that shrine (*fanum*). I want you to think about it to the same degree that you love me. As for me, I have no doubts about its type (for I like Clu-*atius's* plan) nor about the thing itself (for it is decided). About its location I am not certain, so I want you to think about it. To the extent that it can happen in such a rational age as this<sup>30</sup>, I truly will deify (*consecrabo*) her with every type of memorial taken from the genius of all the Greeks and Latins. This thing perhaps might scratch open my wound (*vulnus*) again. But I now think that I am bound as if by some vow or promise, and that large amount of time when I will not exist matters to me more than this small amount of time that feels too long to me as it is. I have tried everything, and can find nothing that brings me any peace. For while I was working on what I wrote you about before, it was as if I was applying a remedy to my suffering. Now I reject everything and have nothing easier to tolerate than solitude.

This passage reveals a number of things about Cicero's thinking on the *fanum*. In it, Cicero notes that he is still troubled by recollections, presumably about Tullia and her death. He pauses from his sorrows to remind Atticus about the *fanum*, which he says they have discussed many times already. He says he got the idea from the authors he has been reading, who say it is «fitting» (or «necessary»)<sup>31</sup> to create a *fanum*. Cicero then notes that he is certain about two things: what form it should take, and that it should happen. He also names a person, Clu-*atius*, presumably an architect<sup>32</sup>, who has helped him with it. The only thing he is uncertain about is location, and he asks Atticus to help him with that. He then remarks that even though he lives in a more rational age, the main purpose of the *fanum* will be to deify<sup>33</sup> Tullia.

Exactly how the *fanum* will accomplish deification is unclear, since the phrase Cicero uses is vague: «I will deify her with every type of memorial (*monimenta*) taken from the genius of all the Greeks and Latins». *Monimentum* (= *monumentum*) refers to anything that preserves the memory of something or someone, and could indicate a wide range of things (including a building, statue, structure, or tomb) that functioned as a monument or memorial. The term could also be applied to written

<sup>30</sup> Literally, «in such learned times as these» (*his temporibus tam eruditis*).

<sup>31</sup> Either «fitting» or «necessary», since *oportere* can mean either.

<sup>32</sup> Shackleton Bailey 1966, 312.

<sup>33</sup> The verb he again uses for «deify» is *consecro*, «to consecrate, deify, immortalize».



works or records that preserved the memory of a person or event. Given that the term is used here in connection with the *fanum*, it seems most likely Cicero is thinking of a structure that will include a number of different types of memorial devices influenced by Greek and Roman practice. I will say a little bit more about what form the *fanum* might have taken below.

To conclude our analysis of this passage, it is also important to note that Cicero is somewhat conflicted about building the *fanum*. He says he realizes that building it might «scratch open his wound (*vulnus*) again», but also says that he feels deeply obligated to build it («as if by some vow or promise») and suggests that once he does, it may bring him the peace that nothing else has, including all of the writing he has recently been doing. This tension between the peace that he hopes the *fanum* might bring him and the chance that it might «scratch open his wound again» is one that will be relevant when we explore considerations he brings up in the *Tusculan Disputations* that seem ultimately to have convinced him not to build the *fanum*.

When Cicero uses the term *fanum*, what sort of building or monument does he have in mind? The Latin term is translated variously into English as a «sanctuary» or «temple» depending on the context, and overlaps with other Latin words for sacred structures such as *templum*, *aedes*, *cella*, *sacellum*, *sacrarium*, and the previously discussed *delubrum*. Åke Fridh, who studied the use of these terms in detail, concluded that the term *fanum* had a broader range of meaning than some of the other terms for sacred spaces and buildings, and can be translated, depending on the context, as «temple, open space before a temple, temple area, etc».<sup>34</sup>

Although *fanum* was thus a fairly general term, Cicero seems to have definite ideas about its form and purpose when he writes to Atticus about it. First, he says a number of things in his letters to Atticus about its potential construction, physical form, and location. As noted earlier, he seems to have had an architect picked out, and in some of his other letters Cicero discusses physical features he wants the *fanum* to have. He mentions in several passages that it is very important that it should not resemble a tomb, but a *fanum*<sup>35</sup>, indicating that he thought that the *fanum* would be visually distinguishable from a tomb. In two letters Cicero

---

<sup>34</sup> OLD 1983: 676 *fanum*; Fridh 1990, 187.

<sup>35</sup> *Att.* 12, 35 (SB 274) and 12, 36 (SB 275).

discusses columns that seem destined for the *fanum*<sup>36</sup>, and Henning Wrede plausibly suggests that Cicero may have envisioned a temple-style *fanum*<sup>37</sup>. It is possible that the *fanum* also would have included the statue dedicated to Tullia that Cicero mentioned in the passage from the *Consolatio*, and an inscription of some sort praising Tullia and explaining the good qualities she possessed that merited her deification.

Apart from these indications of the physical form of the *fanum*, Cicero repeatedly mentions three essential qualities the *fanum* must have: it must effect the divinization or *apotheosis* (ἀποθέωσις in Greek, *consecratio* in Latin) of Tullia<sup>38</sup>, it must have a prominent location (*celebritas*, or «maximum exposure»)<sup>39</sup>, and it must last far into the future<sup>40</sup>. These three qualities of the *fanum* are related. Once Cicero had constructed a *fanum* that embodied and proclaimed the qualities that recognized Tullia as divine, it was important to him that Tullia's deification be known by as many people as possible (its *celebritas*), and that the *fanum* be in a spot where it could be cared for and endure as far into the future as possible. In a number of letters he also mentions a fourth important factor: he plans to retire permanently from politics and live out the rest of his life on the property where the *fanum* would be located<sup>41</sup>. Cicero considered many locations for the *fanum*, including along the coast south of Rome at Astura<sup>42</sup>, different *horti* (estates) across the Tiber near Rome<sup>43</sup>, at Arpinum, at Ostia, and at Tusculum, where Tullia had died<sup>44</sup>. He was constantly weighing the relative advantages and disadvantages of each

<sup>36</sup> *Att.* 12, 19 (SB 257) and 13, 6 (SB 310).

<sup>37</sup> Wrede 1981, 91. Cole 2013, 4-5 notes that Cicero uses the Greek term ἀφίδρυμα for Tullia's monument in *Att.* 13, 29, 1 (SB 300), a term usually used for «a statue of a god or goddess or a copy of a statue or shrine».

<sup>38</sup> *Att.* 12, 18 (SB 254); 12, 19 (SB 257); 12, 12 (SB 259); 12, 36 (SB 275); 12, 37a (SB 277). On the concept of *apotheosis* in Roman religion, see Levene 2012.

<sup>39</sup> *Att.* 12, 19 (SB 257); 12, 23 (SB 262); 12, 37 (SB 276); 13, 29 (SB 300).

<sup>40</sup> In both *Att.* 12, 19 (SB 257) and 12, 36 (SB 275) Cicero worries that properties he is considering for the *fanum* may change ownership so frequently that it will be hard to ensure the *fanum* is well maintained and preserves Tullia's memory.

<sup>41</sup> *Att.* 12, 25 (SB 264); 12, 29 (SB 268); 12, 44 (SB 285); 13, 1 (SB 296). The term that Cicero and Atticus use for a retreat in old age is ἐγγήραμα. On this aspect of Roman villas, see Bodel 1997, 22-23.

<sup>42</sup> Astura: *Att.* 12, 19 (SB 257).

<sup>43</sup> Cicero considers estates across the Tiber owned by Drusus, Lamia, Cassius, Silius, Damasippus, Scapula, Publicius, and Clodia. He mentions most of these estates multiple times in his correspondence with Atticus about the *fanum*. On what we know about the location of these estates and their relative proximity to Rome and Ostia, see Zevi 2004.

<sup>44</sup> Arpinum at *Att.* 12, 12 (SB 259); Ostia at *Att.* 12, 23 (SB 262); Tusculum at *Att.* 12, 37 (SB 276); 12, 41 (SB 283); 12, 43 (SB 284); 12, 44 (SB 285); 13, 26 (SB 286).

place in letters to Atticus during this period, deliberating about how different locations for the *fanum* would effect Tullia's deification and might work as a place for him to spend the rest of his life looking after it.

Cicero also stresses in his letters to Atticus, including the one quoted above, that he feels he must complete the task. In four letters he uses language that indicates he felt he was under an obligation to do so. He says he considers himself bound «as if by a sort of vow and pledge»<sup>45</sup>, says the completion of the *fanum* will relieve him of a «duty owed»<sup>46</sup>, says he «regards it as something owed»<sup>47</sup>, and says that unless he finishes the *fanum* that summer, he will not think himself «free from crime»<sup>48</sup>. It has puzzled commentators<sup>49</sup> that Cicero speaks of his obligation to build the *fanum* as if he had formally pledged to do so, but the simplest explanation may be that he felt bound because he had publicly announced, in the *Consolatio*, that he intended to obtain divine honors for Tullia. But after discussing the *fanum* with Atticus in so many letters from March to July 45, expending so much energy planning its form, looking for a location for it, and saying he felt he absolutely must do it, in the end he seems not to have built it<sup>50</sup>. Why? Clues lie in two of Cicero's writings in July 45: a letter to Atticus in which he relates that he has heard Caesar has plans that will interfere with his purchase of property for the *fanum* across the Tiber, and his composition of the *Tusculan Disputations*.

#### 4. *The Scapula estate and Caesar's plans for Rome*

Cicero wrote to Atticus in 13.33a (SB 330) from Tusculum around July 9, 45, reporting that he heard from Capito<sup>51</sup> that Caesar was going to propose a law to enlarge the city of Rome by diverting the Tiber to flow

<sup>45</sup> *Att. 12, 18* (SB 254): *quasi voto quodam et promisso*.

<sup>46</sup> *Att. 12, 23* (SB 262): *levatio ... officii debiti*.

<sup>47</sup> *Att. 12, 38a* (SB 279): *hoc mihi debere videor*.

<sup>48</sup> *Att. 12, 41* (SB 283): *scelere me liberatum non putabo*.

<sup>49</sup> Including Shackleton Bailey 1966, 404.

<sup>50</sup> Shackleton Bailey 1966, 411. In *Att. 15, 15* (SB 393), written in mid-June 44, Cicero mentions the *fanum* for the last time. In the letter Cicero talks about various sources of funds he thought he had, including «funds put aside for that *fanum*» (*ad illud fanum sepositum*). He refers to the funds for the *fanum* as if he thought they still existed, implying that he never built the *fanum*.

<sup>51</sup> C. Ateius Capito, a supporter of Caesar and Cicero's good friend.

closer to the Vatican hills, bringing the present Campus Martius within the city, and making the area near the Vatican a new Campus Martius. When Cicero mentioned to Capito that he was thinking of buying the Scapula estate across the Tiber, Capito advised him not to, saying that he was sure the law would pass. As it turned out, Caesar did not live long enough to carry out his ambitious plan to redirect the Tiber, but the possibility was enough to prevent Cicero from bidding on Scapula's property. The Scapula estate had been Cicero's favorite candidate as a place for the *fanum*, and he mentions it in numerous letters to Atticus<sup>52</sup>. Losing it must have been a great blow to his plans, and as Shackleton Bailey notes, Cicero stops mentioning the *fanum* at this point in his letters, except for a passing mention in a letter a year later<sup>53</sup>.

Caesar's plan must have come as a shock to Cicero, and explains why he would have abandoned further thought not only of the Scapula estate, but of any of the other properties across the Tiber he had been considering for the *fanum*. Like the Scapula estate, they too might be bought up by Caesar and thus be unsuitable for the *fanum*. But why with this setback does Cicero seem to abandon the idea of building the *fanum* altogether? Why did he not reconsider the sites outside of Rome, including Astura, Ostia, Arpinum, and Tusculum that he had mentioned earlier in his letters to Atticus as possible candidates for the *fanum*? Of these locations, Tusculum, the site of Cicero's favorite villa and not far from Rome, had been the leading candidate, and Cicero, at this point in July 45, had just returned to Tusculum from Arpinum and would have had the opportunity to carry out the *fanum* project there if he wished. We may never know the exact answer to this question, but there may be an answer to it in another project he was working on in Tusculum precisely at this time: the *Tusculan Disputations*.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Att.* 12, 37 (SB 276); 12, 38a (SB 279); 12, 39 (SB 280); 12, 40 (SB 281); 12, 41 (SB 283); 12, 42 (SB 282); 12, 43 (SB 284); 12, 44 (SB 285); 13, 26 (SB 286); 12, 47 (SB 288); 12, 49 (292); 12, 52 (SB 294); 13, 27 (SB 298); 13, 28 (SB 299); 13, 29 (SB 300); 13, 31 (SB 302); 13, 33a (SB 330).

<sup>53</sup> Shackleton Bailey 1966, 411. Cicero's final mention of the *fanum* is in *Att.* 15, 15 (SB 393), dated to mid-June 44. (See above, note 50)

### 5. *Death and grief in the Tusculan Disputations*

In the summer of 45, a few months after he finished the *Consolatio* and was still discussing aspects of the *fanum* with Atticus, Cicero found a way to deal with his grief and put it into broader perspective in the *Tusculan Disputations*. Cicero composed the work in the summer of 45, probably during July and August<sup>54</sup>, while residing in his villa at Tusculum. As noted earlier, he had begun the most recent round of his philosophical writing with the *Hortensius* shortly before Tullia died, and after her death he continued to write philosophy almost obsessively, finding it to be one of the few things that took his mind off of his grief<sup>55</sup>. During this period from March to August 45 he wrote the *Consolatio*, the *Academica*, and the *De Finibus*. It was also at that time that he found it almost impossible to return to the scene of Tullia's death, at Tusculum. He stayed away for three months, and was only able to return with great apprehension around May 17, 45<sup>56</sup>. Once back in Tusculum he found it difficult to be there<sup>57</sup>, but he settled in, and stayed in Tusculum for most of the summer<sup>58</sup>, continuing to write philosophical works, to receive friends and guests<sup>59</sup>, and to work on finding a place for Tullia's *fanum*<sup>60</sup>.

Scholars have often noted that Cicero's philosophical output during this period, the spring, summer, and fall of 45, was astounding. After

---

<sup>54</sup> Although scholars disagree about when Cicero wrote the *Tusculan Disputations*, most place it in July-August 45. See Marinone 2004, 215 for an overview of how various scholars have dated it.

<sup>55</sup> Cicero stresses how important reading and especially writing philosophy were for him in dealing with his sorrow at Tullia's death in many letters, including *Att.* 12, 15 (SB 252); 12, 16 (SB 253); 12, 18 (SB 254); 12, 28 (SB 267); 12, 38 (SB 278); 12, 38a (SB 279).

<sup>56</sup> He discusses how difficult he is finding it to return to Tusculum in a number of letters: *Att.* 12, 44 (SB 285); 13, 26 (SB 286); 12, 46 (SB 287); 12, 48 (SB 289).

<sup>57</sup> 12, 45 (SB 290).

<sup>58</sup> Cicero was at Tusculum for most of the summer, except for two weeks he spent at his villa in Arpinum from approximately June 22 to July 6.

<sup>59</sup> In his letters to Atticus at the time, he mentions a number of visitors at Tusculum, including (from May 17 to June 18, 45): Atticus, Curtius Nicias, P. Valerius Brutus, Trebatius, Curtius Postumus, Dolabella, Torquatus, Spinther; (from July 9 to Aug 24): Varro, C. Capito, T. Carrinas, Brutus, Atticus, Aelius Lamia, Dolabella, L. Cornelius Balbus minor, and Phamea.

<sup>60</sup> Cicero mentions the *fanum* and business connected with it in many letters after he returns to Tusculum in May. In letters at Tusculum (May 20 to June 10, 45): *Att.* 12, 49 (SB 292); 12, 51 (SB 293); 12, 52 (SB 294); 13, 1 (SB 296); 13, 27 (SB 298); 13, 28 (SB 299); 13, 29 (SB 300); 13, 30 (SB 303); 13, 31 (SB302); 13, 32 (SB 305); 13, 3 (SB 308); 13, 33 (SB 309); 13, 6 (SB 310); 13, 5 (SB 312); 13, 7 (SB 314); in letters at Arpinum (June 22 to July 4, 45): 13, 11 (SB 319); 13, 12 (SB 320); 13, 22; (SB 329); and in one letter when he returns from Arpinum to Tusculum (July 9, 45): 13, 33a (SB 330).

Tullia's death and the completion of the *Hortensius* and *Consolatio*, Cicero managed to complete two of his most sophisticated and complex philosophical dialogues: the *Academica* dealing with issues of epistemology (written originally in two books, soon recast into four), and the *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum* treating the ethical views of the Epicureans, the Stoics, and the recently revived Old Academy of Antiochus. Cicero worked hard on both works, but in neither of them does he directly address themes related to Tullia's death<sup>61</sup>. The time he spent on the two works provided him with much needed distraction from the sorrow he felt at losing Tullia<sup>62</sup>, and prepared him to begin a work that would help him see that it would be a mistake to build the *fanum*: the *Tusculan Disputations*.

The form and content of the *Tusculan Disputations* show that Cicero is using the work, at least partially, to help him put the grief he felt at Tullia's death into a broader philosophical perspective. The form of the *Tusculans*, as many have noted, is unlike any of Cicero's other philosophical works<sup>63</sup>. It is not set up as a dialogue between named interlocutors, but as a set of rhetorical exercises on philosophical themes. Cicero calls these exercises *scholae*, or «lectures», on different philosophical topics<sup>64</sup>. He says in the introduction of the work that these are *scholae* he conducted with friends visiting him at Tusculum, but he names none of the interlocutors with whom he speaks in the work. Although some manuscripts of the *Tusculan Disputations* include the initials "M." and "A." to indicate the speaker and his interlocutor, and scholars have debated their possible significance, these abbreviations apparently were

---

<sup>61</sup> Altman 2008 has argued that in the *De Finibus* Cicero alludes in important ways to Tullia's death and sacrifice as a mother. The article makes some excellent points, but I am not convinced that the evidence is strong enough to see explicit references to Tullia's death in the work, nor (as he suggests) to see the *De Finibus* as a replacement for the *fanum*.

<sup>62</sup> Cicero does hint obliquely at the death of Tullia and the sorrow it caused him in the *Academica*. At *Ac.* 1, 11 he talks about «being struck by a most serious blow of fortune» (*fortunae gravissimo percussus vulnere*) (here probably referring to Tullia's death), and «being released from participation in government» (*administratione rei publicae liberatus*), and says he «seeks a cure for his grief from philosophy» (*doloris medicinam a philosophia peto*). At *Ac.* 2, 135 he refers in passing to Crantor's *On Grief* without mentioning his own recent grief at Tullia's death, which he could not do at this point in the text even if he had wished given the dramatic date and setting of the dialogue.

<sup>63</sup> For helpful discussions on the unique form of the *Tusculan Disputations*, see Douglas 1995; Graver 2002, xv-xvii; Gildenhard 2007, 3-88.

<sup>64</sup> At *Tusc.* 1, 7, he calls them «lectures in the manner of the Greeks» (*scholas Graecorum more*).

not Cicero's<sup>65</sup>. Cicero thus did not name the speaker and interlocutors, and why he did not has naturally puzzled commentators<sup>66</sup>. Cicero discusses the topics he addresses in general philosophic terms as befits *scholae*, and though he nowhere explicitly mentions Tullia or her death in the work, he refers to the *Consolatio* in a number of places<sup>67</sup>, allowing him to allude to Tullia's death and the grief he felt at it in a clear if indirect way. In the *Tusculan Disputations* he seems to have reached a new stage in dealing with the death of his daughter that he was unable to attain when he wrote the *Consolatio*.<sup>68</sup>

But what was this new stage? As A.E. Douglas has suggested, «In the *Tusculans* we see the physician of the soul trying to heal himself»<sup>69</sup>. This is an important observation, and it is striking that the healing takes the form that it does. Rather than a heart-to-heart conversation with himself, Cicero to Cicero, as in the *Consolatio*, or a philosophical discussion between himself and other named interlocutors, which is the form the other philosophical dialogues took that he was writing at the time, the *Academica*, *De Finibus*, and *De Natura Deorum*, Cicero makes the discussion in the *Tusculan Disputations* take a more distanced and ostensibly objective form. He does not explicitly name the interlocutors, and he treats the main topics he discusses in the five books of the work<sup>70</sup> – indifference to death (Book 1), enduring pain (Book 2), lessening grief (Book 3), dealing with other emotions (Book 4), and how virtue is sufficient for happiness (Book 5) – as rhetorical and philosophical exercises, not as a polished philosophical dialogue like the *Academica* or *De Finibus*. Most significantly, as noted above, the *Consolatio* is mentioned or referred to in six different places in the *Tusculan Disputations*, in ways that show he still sees it as a valuable work, but can now critique it and move beyond it.

In the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero refers to several sections of the *Consolatio* that he continues to consider to be valuable: (1) the arguments

---

<sup>65</sup> On these initials, see Dougan 1905, 13 (note on 1.9); Douglas 1985, 16, and 1995, 198 n. 2.

<sup>66</sup> For a recent and thorough discussion of the problem and previous attempts to solve it, see Gildenhard 2007, 21-34.

<sup>67</sup> The *Consolatio* is mentioned or directly referred to at *Tusc.* 1, 65-66; 1, 76; 1, 83-84; 3, 70-71; 3, 76; 4, 63.

<sup>68</sup> This point is well made in Mazzoli 1982, 371.

<sup>69</sup> Douglas 1995, 214.

<sup>70</sup> Cicero summarizes the main topics he treats in the five books of the *Tusculan Disputations* at *Div.* 2, 1-5, when he reviews the philosophic works he has written up to that point in his life.

for why the soul is divine (*Tusc.* 1, 65-66), (2) the argument that there are so many evils in life that death is often to be welcomed (*Tusc.* 1, 76; 1, 83-84), (3) the belief that examples of men who have borne the deaths of their sons without excessive grief provide valuable lessons (*Tusc.* 3, 70-71; 4, 63). But there are other things about the *Consolatio*, Cicero notes, that seem less true now that he has gained more perspective on his grief. As Cicero acknowledges, he now realizes that when he wrote the *Consolatio*, «[my] mind was in a swollen state and I attempted every cure I could in it»<sup>71</sup>. And now that his soul is not in this swollen state, Cicero is able to think more clearly about his grief. This point is echoed in a passage later in the work, when Cicero notes that he had composed the *Consolatio* when he was writing «in the middle of his mourning and grief» (*in medio[...] maerore et dolore*), and went against the views of the Stoic Chrysippus on dealing with grief that he is endorsing in the *Tusculan Disputations*<sup>72</sup>. In both of these descriptions, Cicero writes as one who has moved on from the grief he was dealing with at the time he wrote the *Consolatio*, and who has gained a new perspective.

Although he expresses it in the *Tusculans* in more general terms than he had in the *Consolatio*, Cicero also demonstrates that he now has a new perspective on (1) the grief he felt about Tullia's death and (2) the *fanum* he had once felt obligated to build. Two passages in particular in the *Tusculum Disputations* make this clear.

First, as Stephen White has convincingly argued<sup>73</sup>, one of Cicero's greatest accomplishments in the *Tusculans* is setting out an important argument of the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus about the voluntary nature of grief. Cicero, following Chrysippus, argues in *Tusc.* 3, 62-72 that mourners often hold the opinion that «it is necessary, it is right, that it is a duty» to be distressed, but that this is wrong. Once we realize that nothing about grief is «necessary», we can choose to put our grief aside. As Cicero writes in this section (*Tusc.* 3, 61-62; 3, 64; and 3, 66):

(61-62) Sed ad hanc opinionem magni mali cum illa etiam opinio accessit, oportere, rectum esse, ad officium pertinere ferre illud aegre quod acciderit, tum denique efficitur illa gravis aegritudinis perturbatio. ex hac opinione sunt illa varia et detestabilia genera lugendi[...] (64) Haec omnia recta, vera, debita

<sup>71</sup> *Tusc.* 3, 76: *erat enim in tumore animus, et omnis in eo temptabatur curatio.*

<sup>72</sup> *Tusc.* 4, 63.

<sup>73</sup> White 1995.



putantes faciunt in dolore[...] (66) Si igitur deponi potest, etiam non suscipi potest; voluntate igitur et iudicio suscipi aegritudinem confitendum est.

(61-62) *But when to this belief of great evil this belief is added, that it is necessary, that it is right, that it amounts to a duty to bear that which has happened poorly, then at last the agitation of deep distress results. From this belief come those varied and detestable types of mourning[...] (64) They do all these things in grief, thinking them right, real, and owed[...] (66) If therefore it [dolor, or grief] is able to be put aside, it is also able not to be engaged in; therefore it must be admitted that distress is engaged in willingly and intentionally.*

Although Cicero nowhere mentions Tullia by name in the *Tusculan Disputations*, his arguments have obvious application to the grief he felt at her death. Part of getting over his daughter's death, Cicero implies, is discovering that mourning is at least partially voluntary, caused by the mistaken belief that it is right and a duty for the mourner to mourn. Note that the language Cicero uses in these passages: the words *oportere*, *rectum*, *officium*, *vera*, and *debita* echo the language that we earlier saw Cicero using in the passages from his letters to Atticus where he described building the *fanum* as an *officium debitum*<sup>74</sup>. In the *Tusculans*, Cicero is not only arguing with himself that feeling grief at Tullia's death is not owed and is counterproductive, but also using language that implies he is beginning to see that things people in their grief feel that they owe their dead loved ones are in fact not owed. In other words, he can now see that the things he once felt were obligations, including building a monument as a sign of his grief for Tullia, are in fact not, and would instead be a mistake and counterproductive.

Cicero's new view of what he had thought was an obligation to build the *fanum* becomes even clearer in a second passage that follows shortly (3, 75), in which Cicero employs an example that directly parallels his plans for a *fanum* for Tullia<sup>75</sup>. He tells how Artemisia, the wife of King Mausolus, constructed a burial monument for her husband and wasted away the rest of her life grieving in the shadow of the monument. Cicero takes Artemisia as an example of someone who was never able to get over her grief because under the influence of the monument she built for

---

<sup>74</sup> *Att.* 12, 18 (SB 254); 12, 23 (SB 262); 12, 38a (SB 279); 12, 41 (SB 283).

<sup>75</sup> Erskine 1997, 38 briefly mentions this passage about Artemisia and the Mausoleum in a discussion of Cicero's failure to build the *fanum*, but does not draw out its implications.

her husband her grief was always *recens* («fresh», «recent»)<sup>76</sup>. Cicero writes (*Tusc.* 3, 75):

Ut Artemisia illa, Mausoli Cariae regis uxor, quae nobile illud Halicarnassi fecit sepulcrum, quam diu vixit, vixit in luctu, eodemque etiam confecta contabuit. Huic erat illa opinio cotidie recens, quae tum denique non appellatur recens, cum vetustate exaruit.

*So that famous Artemisia, wife of Mausolus the king of Caria, who built that renowned burial monument at Halicarnassus, lived in grief as long as she lived, and she actually wasted away consumed by the same [monument]. This belief [that it was a duty to feel distress] was fresh for her every day, and it is only no longer called recent, when it dries up through length of time.*

Given this passage, it seems clear that by the middle to the end of the summer of 45 when he was writing the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero had come to a new understanding about his former plan to build a monument and live out the rest of his life in its shadow. In the *Tusculans*, Cicero endorses Chrysippus's view that in order to get over grief one must see that it is not duty, and by using the vivid example of Artemisia and the renowned Mausoleum, shows he realizes that constructing a *fanum* to Tullia would only serve as a constant reminder to him of his grief, and keep it *recens*. Although Artemisia's monument was a tomb, and Cicero's *fanum* would have been a monument to Tullia's divine nature, both structures were clearly alike in one important aspect: they would both have been attempts by their builders to commemorate their loved one extravagantly in architectural terms. While writing the *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero came to see in Artemisia a sad image of his own predicament if he had built the *fanum* and, as he had planned, lived out the rest of his life in its shadow. Artemisia represents an almost dystopian vision of Cicero's earlier plans for the *fanum*. She shows that no matter how glorious the monument one builds, and how famous it becomes, it does not necessarily help one's grief to go away. In fact, far from bringing him peace, Cicero came to realize that it might keep his grief, or as he had called it at *Att.* 12, 18 (SB 254), his *vulnus*, always fresh (*recens*) and thus never allow him fully to get over it. The *fanum*, like Artemisia's

---

<sup>76</sup> For an excellent treatment of Cicero's discussion of how the *recens* (πρόσφατον in Greek) nature of grief affects how consolation is able to take place, see Luciani 2010, 322-334.

monument, would only continue to remind him of his loss and reinforce the belief that it was right to mourn Tullia, keeping his grief perpetually fresh.

If this account is right, not only does it help to explain why Cicero decided not to build Tullia's *fanum*, but also allows us to see the *Tusculan Disputations*, at least partially, as a transformation of and replacement for it<sup>77</sup>. At the same time as his efforts to find a piece of property on which to build the *fanum* and celebrate her deification failed, Cicero came to see that building the *fanum* would represent an unnecessary and potentially unending gesture of grief that would not be helpful to Tullia or himself. Thanks to Chrysippus's arguments, Cicero realized that it was not Tullia who was requiring him to build the *fanum*, but his own false sense of what he felt he owed her. And because of his reflection on Zeno's arguments that distress is caused by the belief that evil is present and «fresh»<sup>78</sup>, and that Artemisia's construction of the Mausoleum demonstrated this, he seems to have decided that constructing Tullia's monument would only provide a place where his grief would always be "fresh" and perhaps never heal.

#### 6. Further thoughts about losing a loved one in *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia*

Although Cicero gave up his plans to build the *fanum* for Tullia, this did not mean, of course, that he stopped missing her deeply. In *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia*<sup>79</sup>, both written in 44 about a year after the *Tusculan Disputations* in the midst of great political turmoil<sup>80</sup>, Cicero discusses the loss of a child and close friends in terms that, although not

---

<sup>77</sup> This process parallels, to a certain extent, Cicero's replacement of the physical tomb of Archimedes (which he says in *Tusc.* 5, 64-65 he uncovered as it was wasting away outside the gates of Syracuse in 75 when he was quaestor in Sicily) with a more lasting representation of it in words in the *Tusculan Disputations*. For an excellent account of Cicero's treatment of the tomb of Archimedes in the *Tusculan Disputations* and its larger implications, see Jaeger 2002.

<sup>78</sup> *Tusc.* 3, 75

<sup>79</sup> As Powell 1988, 93-94 notes, the original titles of the dialogues were *Cato Maior*, subtitled *De Senectute*, and *Laelius*, subtitled *De Amicitia*. I refer to the dialogues by their subtitles.

<sup>80</sup> *De Senectute* was probably written before March 15, 44, and *De Amicitia* in the summer or fall of the same year. See Powell 1988, 267-268 and Marinone 2004, 235.

explicitly mentioning Tullia, show that he had continued to think about what it meant to lose someone who had been so deeply loved.

In *De Senectute*, Cicero depicts Cato the Elder speaking with Scipio Aemilianus and Laelius about how to bear old age well. The dramatic date of the dialogue is 150, when Cato was 84 and Scipio and Laelius were in their mid-thirties<sup>81</sup>. At the end of *De Senectute* (84), Cato reflects on what his son, M. Cato, meant to him, how much he missed him, and how he looked forward to seeing him again soon.

O praeclarum diem cum in illud divinum animorum concilium coetum-  
que proficiscar cumque ex hac turba et colluvione discedam! proficiscar  
enim non ad eos solum viros, de quibus ante dixi, verum etiam ad Catonem  
meum, quo nemo vir melior natus est, nemo pietate praestantior, cuius a me  
corpus est crematum, quod contra decuit ab illo meum, animus vero non me  
deserens sed respectans, in ea profecto loca discessit quo mihi ipsi cernebat  
esse veniendum. quem ego meum casum fortiter ferre visus sum, non quo  
aequo animo ferrem, sed me ipse consolabar existimans non longinquum in-  
ter nos digressum et discessum fore.

*O splendid day, when I will set out for that divine assembly and company  
of souls, and when I will leave this tumult and pollution! I will set out not only  
to those men whom I talked about before, but even to my Cato. No better man  
was born, no one was more outstanding in affection (pietas). His body was  
cremated by me; my body should more fittingly have been cremated by him.  
But his soul, not deserting me but gazing back at me, has surely left for those  
places where it perceived I myself must go. I appear to bear this misfortune of  
mine bravely, not because I bear it with a calm mind (aequo animo), but be-  
cause I console myself with the thought that our parting and separation will  
not last long.*

It is hard not to think that when Cicero wrote these words describing Cato's thoughts on losing his son, he was also thinking about his loss of his daughter Tullia<sup>82</sup>. Here, Cicero depicts Cato as having come to accept the death of his son, M. Cato, and has Cato talk about his son in terms very similar to those he had used of Tullia in letters to Atticus.<sup>83</sup> Cato

<sup>81</sup> For the dramatic setting and ages of those involved, see Powell 1988, 16-22.

<sup>82</sup> As noted by Powell 1988, 2-3; 174; 240; 261; 265.

<sup>83</sup> At *Att.* 11, 25 (SB 231) Cicero had remarked of Tullia that «I think nothing ever like her has been born» (*nihil umquam simile natum puto*), and at *Att.* 11, 17 (SB 228) he praises Tullia's *virtus*, *humanitas*, and *pietas*. For the nature of the bond of *pietas* between Cicero and Tullia, see Zaman 2009.

praises his son's good qualities (especially his *pietas*), expresses sadness that it was he who buried him rather than the opposite, and says he bears his loss, if not with a calm mind, at least with the thought that they will soon be reunited in the afterlife.

Cato's and Cicero's losses of their children were parallel in several ways. First, both of their losses were recent: Cato's son had died in 152, two years before the dramatic date of the dialogue; Tullia had died in 45, a little over a year before Cicero finished the *De Senectute* in March 44. Cicero thus depicts Cato in a similar position to himself: having time to have gained some perspective on the death of his child, but still missing him very much. Second, Cicero depicts Cato as someone who, though he appears to bear the death of his son bravely, does not do so because his mind is no longer troubled by his loss, but because he has come to look at it in a new light. Cicero here has Cato distinguish explicitly between his son's body and soul. Cato notes that he had cremated his son's body, and was not able to have his body cremated by his son, as would have been more natural. But he has come to see that while his son's body is now gone, his soul is not. Cato's and his son's souls have been separated, but they will meet again, in the afterlife. This perspective is a relevant one for Cicero, too. Cicero, who had never mentioned Tullia's cremation or burial in any of his letters, here may be thinking about what happened to her body, as well as looking forward to being reunited with her soul when he dies. It is a perspective that leaves little space for anything like a *fanum*. Funeral rites and a tomb for the body, along with the knowledge that their souls will be reunited in the afterlife, allows Cato and Cicero some peace, if not complete equanimity.

*De Amicitia*, written a few months after *De Senectute*, is a dialogue set in 129. In the work, Cicero has Laelius describe his reaction to the death of his closest friend Scipio Aemilianus. In two different sections, what Laelius says reveals Cicero's further thoughts on dealing with the death of a loved one<sup>84</sup>. In the first passage he writes (*Amic.* 10)<sup>85</sup>:

ego si Scipionis desiderio me moveri negem, quam id recte faciam vident sapientes, sed certe mentiar. moveor enim tali amico orbatus, qualis, ut arbitror, nemo umquam erit, ut confirmare possum, nemo certe fuit. sed non

<sup>84</sup> For a recent analysis of what Cicero says in the *De Amicitia* on friendship, death, and loss, and how it relates to his loss of Tullia, see Konstan 2015.

<sup>85</sup> For a helpful analysis of the themes of absence and desire in *De Amicitia*, see Leach 1993.

egeo medicina: me ipse consolor et maxime illo solacio, quod eo errore careo, quo amicorum decessu plerique angi solent. nihil mali accidisse Scipioni puto; mihi accidit, si quid accidit; suis autem incommodis graviter angi non amicum, sed se ipsum amantis est.

*But if I should deny that I am moved by my longing for Scipio, although wise men would see whether I did this rightly, I would certainly be lying. For I am moved since I am deprived of such a great friend of the sort, I think, as no one ever will be to me again, and, as I can state with confidence, no one has certainly ever been. But I do not lack a remedy. For I console myself especially with the comforting thought that I am free from the error that tends to distress most people when friends die. I think that nothing bad has happened to Scipio. It has happened to me, if anything bad has happened at all. But to be greatly distressed at one's own misfortunes is the mark of one who loves oneself, not his friend.*

In this passage from *De Amicitia*, Laelius reflects on his loss of Scipio in a way that parallels Cicero's loss of Tullia. Though we cannot be sure Cicero has Tullia in mind as he writes the passage, what he writes is compatible with the views he forged in the *Consolatio* and emended in the *Tusculan Disputations* in the months after her death. He came to see that nothing bad had happened to Tullia, since she had, like all virtuous people, become immortal and like the gods, and since the grief he felt at losing her was something that she did not require of him, but which he had taken on voluntarily.

In a second passage, Cicero reflects further on the topic (*Amic.* 23):

Quocirca et absentes adsunt et egentes abundant et imbecilli valent et, quod difficilium dictu est, mortui vivunt; tantus eos honos memoria desiderium prosequitur amicorum, ex quo illorum beata mors videtur, horum vita laudabilis.

*Wherefore [friends] though absent are present, and though in need have plenty and though weak are strong. And what is more difficult to say, when they are dead, they are alive; so great is the honor, memory, and longing of their friends that attends them. Because of this their death seems blessed, and the life of those [who survive] seems praiseworthy.*

In this second passage from *De Amicitia*, Cicero has Laelius discuss how close friendship results in paradoxical results. While alive, friends

are with us even when we are apart, and have their losses and weaknesses made up by their close friends. In death, friendship is even more powerful. As Laelius notes, dear ones who have passed away live on through the honor, memory, and longing of their friends who are still alive. In this second passage, one sees that Cicero has found a much better way to ensure a lost loved one lives on, not through a monument, but in our memories.

Cato's reflections on his son's death in *De Senectute*, and Laelius's discussion in these two passages and elsewhere in the *De Amicitia*<sup>86</sup> of how the memory of a loved one lives on, demonstrate how Cicero integrated the hard-won lessons he learned about grief at the loss of a loved one from the *Consolatio*, his work on the *fanum*, and the *Tusculan Disputations*. Once Cicero had freed himself from the thought he needed to continue to grieve and build a *fanum* for Tullia and live out the rest of his life in its shadow, he was able to console himself and work out a way to honor Tullia's memory in a truer and more satisfying way, and one which was applicable not just to himself, but to his fellow Romans.<sup>87</sup>

### Works Cited

- Altman 2008: W. Altman, Tullia's Secret Shrine: Birth and Death in Cicero's *De finibus*, «AncPhil» 28, 2008, pp. 373-393.
- Altman 2009: W. Altman, *Womanly Humanism in Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, «TAPA» 139, 2009, pp. 411-445.
- Audano 2006-2007: S. Audano, *Lattanzio e la Consolatio di Cicerone*, «Koinonia» 30-31, 2006-2007, pp. 101-109

---

<sup>86</sup> See also sections 102-104.

<sup>87</sup> Some of the ideas in this paper first began as part of a seminar presentation for an NEH Summer Seminar for College Teachers, "Death, Commemoration, and Society in Ancient Rome" under the direction of John Bodel and Richard Saller in Rome in 1995. I want to thank audiences at the Annual Meeting of the American Philological Society (now Society for Classical Studies) and at the University of Washington for questions and comments on early versions of the paper. I have also benefitted from the Reed College Summer Scholarship Fund, and from comments and encouragement from colleagues at Reed College, including Nigel Nicholson, Ellen Millender, Sonia Sabnis, Jessica Seidman, Thomas Landvatter, Laura Leibman, Gail Sherman, Elizabeth Drumm, and Ellen Stauder; and from Reed College student research assistants James Aaron, Emily Collinson, Cecilia D'Anastasio, Jaye Whitney Debber, Jessica King, Alex McGrath, Laura Moser, Rosa Schneider, and Lucy Williamson. Finally, I want to thank William H.F. Altman and anonymous readers for helpful suggestions about form, content, and bibliography. Any errors that remain are of course my own.

- Baltussen 2009: H. Baltussen, *A Grief Observed: Cicero on Remembering Tullia*, «Mortality» 14, 2009, pp. 355-369.
- Baltussen 2013: H. Baltussen, *Cicero's Consolatio ad se: Character, Purpose and Impact of a Curious Treatise*, in H. Baltussen, (ed.), *Greek and Roman Consolations: Eight Studies of a Tradition and its Aftermath*, Swansea, 2013, pp. 67-91.
- Baraz 2012: Y. Baraz, *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton 2012.
- Beaujeu 1983: J. Beaujeu, *Cicéron, Correspondance Vol. 8: Appendice I: Le Sanctuaire de Tullia*, Paris 1983.
- Bodel 1997: J. Bodel, *Monumental villas and villa monuments*, «JRA» 10, 1997, pp. 5-35.
- Boyancé 1944: P. Boyancé, *L'apothéose de Tullia*, «REA» 46, 1944, pp. 179-184.
- Castagnoli 1984: F. Castagnoli, *Il tempio Romano: Questioni di Terminologia e di Tipologia*, «PBSR» 52, 1984, pp. 3-20.
- Cole 2013: S. Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, Cambridge 2013.
- Dougan 1905: T.W. Dougan, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque, Vol. I*, Cambridge 1905.
- Douglas 1985: A.E. Douglas, *Tusculan Disputations I*, Warminster 1985.
- Douglas 1995: A.E. Douglas, *Form and Content in the Tusculan Disputations*, J.G.E. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford 1995, pp. 197-218.
- Erskine 1997: A. Erskine, *Cicero and the Expression of Grief*, in S.M. Braund and C. Gill (edd.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 36-47.
- Flory 1995: M. Flory, *The Deification of Roman Women*, «AHB» 9, 1995, pp. 127-134.
- Fridh 1990: Å. Fridh, *Sacellum, sacrarium, fanum, and related terms*, in S.-T. Teodorsson (ed.), *Greek and Latin Studies in Memory of Caius Fabricius*, «Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia» 54, 1990, pp. 173-187.
- Gildenhard 2007: I. Gildenhard, *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge 2007.
- Graver 2002: M. Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions: Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4*, Chicago 2002.
- Grilli 2010: A. Grilli (ed.), *Marco Tullio Cicerone: Ortensio. Testo critico, introduzione, versione e commento*, Bologna 2010.
- Guillaumont 1989: F. Guillaumont, *Cicéron et le sacré dans la religion des philosophes*, «BAGB» 1989, 56-71.
- Jaeger 2002: M. Jaeger, *Cicero and Archimedes' Tomb*, «JRS» 92, 2002, pp. 49-61.



- Konstan 2015: D. Konstan, *Cicero on Grief and Friendship*, in A. Tutter and L. Wurmser (edd.), *Grief and its Transcendence: Memory, Identity, Creativity*, New York 2015, pp. 3-14.
- Kumaniecki 1968: K. Kumaniecki, *Die verlorene Consolatio des Cicero*, «ACD» 4, 1968, pp. 27-47.
- Kumaniecki 1972: K. Kumaniecki, *Cicerone e la Crisi della Repubblica Romana*, Rome 1972.
- Leach 1993: E. Leach, *Absence and Desire in Cicero's De Amicitia*, «CW» 87.2, 1993, pp. 3-20.
- Lepage 1976: Y.G. Lepage, *Cicéron devant la mort de Tullia d'après sa correspondance*, «LEC» 44, 1976, pp. 245-258.
- Levene 2012: D.S. Levene, *Defining the Divine in Rome*, «TAPA» 142, 2012, pp. 41-81.
- Luciani 2010: S. Luciani, *Temps et éternité dans l'oeuvre philosophique de Cicéron*, Paris 2010.
- Marinone 2004<sup>2</sup>: N. Marinone, *Cronologia Ciceroniana*, E. Malaspina (ed.), «Colana di Studi Ciceroniani» VI, Roma 2004<sup>2</sup>.
- Mazzoli 1982: G. Mazzoli, *La plebs e il rex (fr. 17 ed. Vitelli): per l'interpretazione della Consolatio ciceroniana*, «Athenaeum» 60, 1982, pp. 359-385.
- Mueller 1890: C.M. Mueller, *Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Manserunt Omnia*, Pars IV, Vol. III, 332-38 (IX *Consolatio*), Leipzig 1890.
- OLD 1983: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, P.G.W. Glare (ed.), Oxford 1983.
- Powell 1995: J.G.F. Powell, *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford 1995.
- Powell 1988: J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero, Marcus Tullius: Cato Maior de senectute*, Cambridge 1988.
- Setaioli 1999: A. Setaioli, *La vicenda dell'anima nella Consolatio di Cicerone*, «Paideia» 54, 1999, pp. 145-174.
- Shackleton Bailey 1965-1970: D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, 7 volumes, Cambridge 1965-1970.
- Shackleton Bailey 1966: D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Volume V (Books XI-XIII), Appendix III *Tullia's Fane*, Cambridge 1966, pp. 404-413.
- Shackleton Bailey 1971: D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero*, London 1971.
- Shackleton Bailey 1977-1978: D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, 2 volumes, Cambridge 1977-1978.
- Shackleton Bailey 1980: D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem et M. Brutum*, Cambridge 1980.
- Sullivan 1944: J. Sullivan, *Consecratio in Cicero*, «CW» 37 1944, pp. 157-159.

- Treggiari 1998: S. Treggiari, *Home and Forum: Cicero between Public and Private*, «TAPA» 128, 1998, pp. 1-23.
- Treggiari 2007: S. Treggiari, *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia: The Women of Cicero's Family*, London 2007.
- Vitelli 1973: C. Vitelli, *La Consolatio ciceroniana: cronologia della composizione*, «RAL» 28, 1973, pp. 673-681.
- Vitelli 1979: C. Vitelli (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Consolationis fragmenta*, Firenze 1979.
- White 1995: S. White, *Cicero and the Therapists*, in J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford 1995, pp. 219-246.
- Wilcox 2005a: A. Wilcox, *Paternal Grief and the Public Eye: Cicero Ad Familiares 4.6*, «Phoenix» 59, 2005, pp. 267-287.
- Wilcox 2005b: A. Wilcox, *Sympathetic Rivals: Consolation in Cicero's Letters*, «AJP» 126, 2005, pp. 237-255.
- Wrede 1981: H. Wrede, *Consecratio in Formam Deorum: Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz am Rhein 1981.
- Zaman 2009: R. Zaman, *Cicero and Tullia: Pietas in late Republican Rome*, «Classicum» 35, 2009, pp. 2-8.
- Zehnacker 1985: H. Zehnacker, *Officium consolantis. Le devoir de consolation dans la correspondance de Cicéron, de la bataille de Pharsale à la mort de Tullia*, «REL» 63, 1985, pp. 69-86.
- Zevi 2004: F. Zevi, *Cicero and Ostia*, in A.G. Zevi and J.H. Humphrey (edd.), *Ostia, Cicero, Gamala, Feasts, and the Economy: Papers in Memory of John D'Arms*. Portsmouth, Rhode Island, *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series Number 57*, 2004, pp. 15-31.